

## **REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 19, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 19, 2009. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9, 14-20, 22, 23 and 32-34 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 14-20, 22, 23 and 32-38 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9, 15-17, 20, 32 and 34 have been amended. New claims 35-38 have been added to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

### Statement of Substance of Interview

On March 16, 2009, a telephonic interview was held between Gero G. McClellan, (attorney of record), Johnny Lam (attorney for Applicants), and Examiner Michael Hicks. The parties discussed the cited references including *Rubin*. Claim 9 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 9. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response. No agreement could be reached at the time of the interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9, 14-20, 22-23, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rubin et al.*, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099552 (hereinafter *Rubin*).

With this response, Applicants have amended independent claim 9 to recite, *inter alia*, “generating a relationship between the annotation and each visible query-related sub-object of the portion of the first view of data, responsive to receiving the annotation to the portion of the first view of data.” Further, Applicants have amended independent claim 17 to recite, *inter alia*, “analyzing, by operation of the one or more computer processors, the second view of data, the record, and the link table to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data.” Independent claims 32 and 34 recite similar limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are not taught by *Rubin*. *Rubin* generally teaches audio annotations. But *Rubin* does not teach associating a particular annotation (which is made to a particular object) to a plurality of sub-objects of the object being annotated in a way that allows the annotation to be visually indicated when the sub-objects are subsequently displayed. This approach effectively extends the association of the annotation with the underlying object to the constituent parts (sub-objects) of the object. This association may then be visually displayed relative to the sub-objects, even when the annotated object is not being displayed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is obviated.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

---

Gero G. McClellan  
Registration No. 44,227  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)